Considerable confusion of thought has arisen as to exactly what was accomplished by the Tydings-McDufEe Law. The *Pros* have asserted that it was the same old Hare-Hawes-Cutting Law. The *Amis* have argued that it was a much improved law. I will confine comment to paraphrasing the remarks of those who, on account of their positions, can speak with authority.

The Tydings-McDuffie measure revived, extended, amended, and superseded the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act. With that innocuous statement no one could quarrel. The changes from the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act involved the extension of the expiration date to October I, 1934, relinquishment of the right of the United States to retain military reservations, and the insertion of a provision that the question of naval bases would be the subject of future negotiations between the United States and the Philippine Republic. An alleged loophole in the law which it was charged made independence uncertain was closed, and the title to the Act was changed so as to make it clear that the independence which the Islands would have at the expiration of the transition period would be complete. With the last observation, all would not agree, for there is no material difference between independence of the Philippine Islands and complete independence of the Philippine Islands. Otherwise the new law was substantially a reenactment of the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act. The Quezon Mission was also able to secure comforting statements from Senator Tydings that those who were in charge

of Philippine affairs in Congress are always ready to lend a sympathetic ear to any suggestion calculated to improve the Independence Law, and from the President that "where imperfections or inequalities exist, I am confident that they can be corrected after proper hearing and in fairness to both peoples."

It is now proper to inquire exactly what additional benefits were obtained by the resurrection of the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act. In the first place, it was indispensable that the much